

Translation of the pertinent portions of a Written  
Notification, mailed 09/27/2004

1. This is the **first** written notification from the  
office entrusted with the international preliminary  
examination.

2. This notification contains information regarding  
the following items:

I Basis of the Report

IV Lack of Unity of the Invention

V Reasoned Determination under Rule 66.2 a)ii)

-----

I Basis of the Report

Regarding the **components** of the international  
application:

**Specification, pages**

1 to 27 in the originally filed version

**Claims, Nos.**

1 to 46 received 06/19/04 with letter of  
06/17/04

**Drawings, sheets**

1/14 to 14/14 in the originally filed version

IV Lack of Unity of the Invention

2. The Office has noted that the requirement for unity  
of the invention has not been met for the following reasons  
and has decided in accordance with Rule 68.1 not to request  
Applicant to restrict the claims or to pay additional fees.

**see attached sheet**

3. Therefore an international preliminary examination  
has been performed for

X the portions of the international application  
relating to claims 1, 2 and 6 to 40.

V Reasoned Determination under Rule 466.2(a)(ii)

1. Determination

Novelty	Claims
Inventive Activities	Claims 12 to 40
Commercial Applicability	

2. Documents and Explanations:

**see attached sheet**

SHEET ATTACHED TO THE WRITTEN NOTIFICATION

**Re.: Item IV**

**Claim 3, as well as claims 41 to 46**

This international office has determined that the international application contains several inventions or groups of inventions, which are not connected by a single common inventive idea (Rule 13.1 PCT), namely:

I: Claims 1, 2, 5 to 40

Devices with at least two web processing tools, wherein the web processing tools each have a mechanically independent drive mechanism, which are in a logical functional connection with a common control device,

II: Claims 3 to 5

Device with three formers, wherein the outer ones are displaced in case of a change of the web width, while the center one remains in place,

II:[sic] Claims 41 to 46

A method for setting web processing tools prior to the start of production by means of presetting values.

The method claims 41 to 46 are not specifically directed to the devices of claims 1 to 40 and therefore no technical connection exists within the meaning of Rule 13.2 PCT, which is expressed in one or several identical or corresponding special technical characteristics. In the same way a technical connection between the special technical characteristics of claim 3 and those of the first group of claims is lacking.

Therefore there is no unity of the invention in accordance with Rules 13.1 and 13.2 PCT between the mentioned groups (I to III) of claims, neither in regard to special technical characteristics nor in regard to objects attained.

Therefore only the first group of claims is examined in this notification.

**Re.: Item V**

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: DE-A-100 03 025

D2: USP 3,734,487  
D3: EP-A-0 457 304

#### Claim 1

Claim 1 contains all characteristics of claim 12 and should therefore be written as a claim dependent from it. This also relates to the further claims 2 and 6 to 1.

#### Claim 12

Document D1 discloses (the references in parentheses relate to this document) a device for processing a web in a web-processing machine with various web processing tools (formers, cutters, etc.), which are movable by at least one actuating member (24, 43) transversely to the running direction of the web (3, 4) of material.

Therefore the object of claim 1 differs from the device known from D1 in that a turning bar unit is arranged upstream of the former.

However, a turning bar unit can be considered to be a customary web processing tool. For example, D2 (see Fig. 2 in particular) discloses a turning bar unit which is also movable transversely to the running direction of the web of material and which can be easily combined with the device from D1 in order to arrive at the subject of claim 12.

Therefore the present application does not meet the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject of claim 12 is not based on inventive activities within the meaning of Article 33(3) PCT.

#### Claim 13

In accordance with the same arguments as those regarding claim 12, the subject of claim 13 does not appear to meet the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT.

#### Claims 14 to 40

The further characteristics of claims 14 to 40 relate to particulars of the device. However, these characteristics are known either from D1 (see the entire document), or D3 (see Example 1, columns 5 to 8), or are suggested to one skilled in the art. In combination with the preceding claims they do not appear to be based on inventive activities (Article 33(3) PCT).